

# ON THE ADDRESS.

Mr. Davin on the Trade Question—The Member for West Assiniboia Makes a Powerful Speech on the Government's Shortcomings — The Result of the Old National Policy — The Grit Application Thereof.

The following is the full text of Mr. Davin's speech on the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to express the opinion of one coming from the Northwest Territories in regard to the Speech from the Throne; I also rise to say something of the grand political situation in this House and in the country as suggested by the Speech from the Throne and illustrated by the debate. Sir, the debate thus far is the most extraordinary debate which, I believe, has ever taken place on an Address in any Parliament. Sir, from this side of the House two powerful arraignments of the Government's position have been made; but from the Ministerial benches, although the two foremost men on that side of the House have spoken, the replies have taken the character of playful badinage, as though the right hon. gentleman who wears now Grand Cross of St. Michael and St. George, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, thought that the people of Canada took no stock whatever in the charges made by hon. gentlemen from this side of the House, or else thought that to those charges there was no answer possible, and that therefore the best way to cover up was by trying to make a joke and then sitting down, in the vain hope—vain assuredly it is—that the people of Canada, or, at least, the Liberals of Canada, would be taken in by a policy so obvious as that. Now, Sir, it has been a very peculiar debate, and I want to call attention to one of its peculiarities. We have had

several comparisons. The Prime Minister compared the leader of the Opposition to a very famous character in classical poetry. Now, my right hon. friend will excuse me if I tell him that there is no such character in Homer or in Shakespeare as Thersites, but there is Thersites (Laughter and cheers.) My hon. friend throws back his head. My hon. friend is eloquent in two languages, and it is therefore excusable, when speaking in the tongue that was originally foreign to him, but in which he is now a master of expression, that he should occasionally mispronounce a word. But he knows as well as I do that in academic halls he was guilty of an unpardonable offence in making the i short in Thersites. However, it was a very extraordinary and inapt comparison, because Thersites is a low ill-shaped railer against the great men of Greece in the Trojan war.

The ex-Minister of Finance compared the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to Ajax. And in the play of Troilus and Cressida Thersites rails at Ajax and rails even at Achilles, but this is to be noted that in nearly everything he said of Ajax, all who knew anything of Ajax would agree with him. Hon. members have all been in the comparative line in this debate. My hon. friend who leads the Opposition compared the right hon. gentleman to Prince Maurice de Talleyrand, and I leave that where it is. The Prime Minister compared the Finance Minister to Alexander of Macedon. I wish I had a spiritualistic

telephone and could transmit the compliment to the great leader of armies wherever he may be. (Laughter.) Then the ex-Finance Minister compared—I am bound to say that when comparisons come from this side of the House and I do not agree with them, I am prepared to express my opinion—compared, not I think very appropriately, the Prime Minister to Nebuchadnezzar. I do not recognize the appropriateness of the comparison of the leader of the Opposition to Thersites any more than that made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce when he compared the leader of the Opposition, not to an individual, but to the whole body of the Israelites of Egypt spilling the Egyptians and then going out into the wilderness to search for gold. But they did not go to search for gold; they went into the wilderness to go to the promised land and were fed on manna in the meanwhile. If the hon. member for Cape Breton (Sir Charles Tupper) is now in the wilderness, he is as certain to go to the promised land as were the children of Israel, although to do it would not take forty years. (Cheers.)

Let me say, as I am speaking of the forms of these speeches, that the Minister of Trade and Commerce—I am sorry he is not in his place—for a man of his experience in Parliament, for a man of his social culture, was guilty of one of the most extraordinary parliamentary crimes that has been ever committed. What was that? I deprecate, unless under extreme necessity, bringing the name of His Excellency into debate in this House. But what did the Minister of Trade and Commerce do? He actually made a reference, which I have here—it would be unbelievable if I could not refer to it—in order, as he thought, to make a point. Because the leader of the Opposition brought before the House certain utterances of His Excellency—the Minister of Trade and Commerce actually suggested that my honorable friend should not have done what no doubt he thought was his duty. And why? Not because it was wrong, not because it was an unpar-

liamentary proceeding, but because he was the recipient of a tribute from their Excellencies on an interesting occasion. This is what the Minister of Trade and Commerce said at the close of his suggestion that it was the Tory party that burnt down the Parliamentary buildings:

"If I am not altogether mistaken "in recalling a certain interesting occasion, not so very long ago, in this "city, among the many costly tributes "which were tendered to the hon. "gentleman, not the least costly, not "the least elegant, was one presented by the exalted personage referred "to. Therefore, I infer that the hon. "gentleman is not so implacable as he "seems."

What the hon. gentleman means to suggest is that the acceptance of a present or gift from a man occupying an august position, by a man occupying one of the highest positions in the Colonial Empire of Britain would be something in the nature of a bribe, a bribe for silence or for expressed flattery. It is one of the most scandalous things that ever took place in Canada, and it is especially scandalous coming from a man of the years and authority and occupying the position of Minister of Trade and Commerce. (Cheers.)

The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) used a phrase which I believed has been unjustly dealt with on this side of the House and even by his own colleagues. I believe injustice has been done to him. The right hon. gentleman said that when the historian sat down to write of Canada he would take the years 1867 and 1897; and I must say the hon. member for York fell into what I deemed an error. He fell into this interpretation of the remark of the Premier, that what he meant was this, that the historian would be troubled exceedingly by the wonderful events that occurred in the summer of 1896 and he would have nothing to say respecting all the events that passed during the previous thirty years, but he would write a history of the country from 1897 on; and the Minister of

Trade and Commerce actually flouted the idea, scouted the idea, drew himself up and put on the the most indignant countenance, and it is a countenance which from long practice can look fierce, and indignant to an extreme degree, and he said, in effect: do you suppose the historian would bother himself with the events of the last thirty years? What I fancy the right hon. Prime Minister, and he will correct me if I am wrong, intended was that 1867 was the beginning of an epoch - and as that year was the beginning of an epoch so 1897 was the beginning of an epoch too. That is a rational statement on the face of it, and it is not open to the laughter that would greet a proposition that the historian would not note what had taken place for thirty years. What was the note of 1867 and the note of those thirty years? National expansion. Who were the men who gave the keynote at that time? They were Macdonald, Tupper, Cartier, George Brown and D'Arcy McGee. Those powerful minds, some of whom remained with us until lately, and one leading name still adorns this House. (Cheers.) I repeat, what was the note of those thirty years? It was national expansion, the national expansion of Canada. And in the hands of the Conservative party, what was done? Province after province was added to the confederation; the Canadian Pacific railway was built, the canals were enlarged and deepened, the Northwest was acquired, and at last, Canada was rounded into the proportion of a nation, so that when the Prime Minister went over to represent us in England at the Jubilee, he represented not a mere colony like New South Wales or Victoria, but he represented seven colonies, and a vast territory of continental proportions, a galaxy of colonies, he represented a country that was bound to take pre-eminence and to take national bulk in the eyes of the Empire and the world. And what did it? It was the note of national expansion and the men whose inspiration that note was; some of

these men are sleeping in their peaceful graves, but their names live for ever, and one of them though sleeping in his long home in the Kingston graveyard, lives by his name and his thoughts, so that today we can say of him as the poet of Albrecht Durer, and which has been translated by Longfellow, who may be thus parodied:

"Dead he is not, but departed;

"Because the truly great man never  
"dies."

A Change of Government.

Well, Sir, in 1873 a change took place. The Government was not beaten, but Sir John Macdonald resigned, and why? It was because he and his Government had made a contract with Sir Hugh Allan and the charge against Sir John was, that he sold the contract. It was supposed to have been an extravagant bargain, but at this day Liberals and Conservatives, and all thoughtful men know that so far from being an extravagant bargain, there is not an engineer of authority you can speak to who will not say: Neither Sir Hugh Allan or any company could have built the road on the terms that were made with him; and as for selling the charter, that charge has been long since exploded. What happened then? Well, as may be seen in this country to-day, as was seen in 1896, and as has been seen all through our history, the Conservative party is much more sensitive in regard to the character of its public men than the Liberal party.

Some hon. members on the Ministerial benches:—"Oh."

Mr. Davin. Yes, it is true, and there is a reason for it. That reason I need not refer to in a detailed analysis, but if you go into the past history of both parties you know very well that not merely did the genius of rule and the instinct of Government belong to the Conservative party, but from one reason or another they had within them more of the light of culture than had the Liberal party.

Liberal cries of: "Oh."

Mr. Davin. That is no reproach to



the Liberal party; they could not help it probably, (laughter), but any way it is a fact. Now, Sir, the result of that charge made in 1878 was that it created a furore throughout all Canada, and Conservatives that never cast a Grit vote in their lives, voted Grit in 1874 when Mr. Mackenzie went to the country. And some of those electors who came back in September, 1878, to put the Conservative party in power, and many of their children and their relatives voted again against the Conservatives in 1896. They voted against the Conservatives last election not entirely because of the school question, for they were dissatisfied about other matters as well, but amongst us in the Northwest Territories and in Manitoba, the language of my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), the language that he used from Halifax to Vancouver, the language that he used in the Windsor Hotel at Montreal, when the banquetting room was placarded with "Death to protection," and every possible motto that could indicate that protection was a curse to the country, the language of the right hon. gentleman at Sohmer Park, and at Winnipeg where he declared: "Protection was slavery as bad as African slavery in the South," and he would rescue us; all that had something to do with changing Conservative votes into Liberal votes. Then the right hon. gentleman came to Moosomin, and dwelt upon the dreadful iniquity of the tax on farming implements from which he would relieve us; at Regina the same silver voice declared that he would leave no tax on implements, and at Moose Jaw when he asked what the freight rates were, he said it was a dreadful thing, and he was going to sweep away the freight rates. Thence he went to British Columbia, and wherever he went he just said the thing that at that moment would please the people, and many of the people believed him.

Does the right hon. gentleman suppose for one moment that the people of the country did not take him ser-

iously? They did take him seriously. They voted for him and they said: We will take your note of hand. But now that he has been in power twenty months, and in his third session, they say: We want you to redeem your notes, we have had enough of the sunny ways, do you suppose that your promises and your pledges are to be regarded as mere barren brambles in these sunny ways? In this year of 1897 our country has had national expansion; we are over five millions of people and the credit of Canada stands as high to-day almost as that of the mother country in the money markets of the world. The portals of time are thrown open. Are these gentlemen who are now clothed with power, who have the priestly garments of the time on, in whose hands fate has put the wand of office; are they able to pronounce the shibboleth which entitles them to enter these portals? The portals of time are thrown open to admit the new era, and do these hon. gentlemen know the word that will entitle them to enter? Sir, the note of these thirty years was national expansion, but the note of 1897, and for the immediate future which lies beyond, is Colonial equality in Imperial Union. (Loud cheers.) Can these gentlemen opposite pronounce the word? They feel the breeze and power of the time in their garments, and they look down the road that should be taken, but it is with a haggard and restless and unfamiliar eye, and they are afraid to tread the path that fate calls on this country to take. (Renewed cheers.)

I say that the note of this time is Colonial equality in Imperial Union, and when the right hon. gentleman went to England he should have sounded that note; we expected him to sound it. He did not represent the Liberals alone—and we know from the member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram) that there are Liberals who are preferential trade men—but he represented Conservatives as well; and from the language that we, and I in my humble way used in this House, when he was about to start, to the

best of our power we gave him a God-speed and declared our confidence in him as a man fit to represent us in England. But the right hon. gentleman apparently did not know; some extraordinary spell was on him, the language that he used in Montreal, and in Toronto, and in St. Johns, was forgotten; there was some malison on him, so that one could apply to him the words of the great modern poet:

"How could the light that lit you for  
"a space.

"Fall through sick weakness of a  
"broken will  
"To the dead cold damnation of dis-  
"grace?"

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the House for one moment to what is not in the Speech, and which we Western members have a right to expect. I see the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) has left the Chamber. When he heard me mention the word Moosomin, I saw he took to his heels, because I manage to make even him hear me when I speak on Northwest matters.

Mr. Bennett. He has gone to read Dan Rose's book.

Mr. Davin. Dan Rose's book? Do you suppose that is what is in his mind now? No. He silently dreams of the golden crop that is to come to him from Klondyke arrangements. Dan Rose's book forsooth! it is but the narrow-necked clams that give appetite to the feast that is before him. Now, Sir, the hon. Minister of the Interior told us at Moosomin that he was opposed to the National Policy. He denounced the National Policy; he condemned it. Sir, the National Policy is there to-day. It was a pleasant thing to me as an old Torontonion to see the face of the member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram), but, Sir, it was of ill-omen to the farmers of this country to see the Address moved in this House by a leading manufacturer, and to hear that hon. gentleman assure us that the manufacturers need not be afraid—that though for a time they had no confidence in the Liberals, yet now they knew the Liberals, and they knew they could

have confidence in them. (Hear, hear.) What does that mean? It means that he knew that the Government were not going to carry out their pledges to the farmers. But of still worse omen was it when the Prime Minister brought a certificate of character—to whom? The Prime Minister has been held up to us in the West as the good Samaritan who was to heal our ills, the liberator who was to free us from slavery, and to break the chains of protection on our ankles, and the gyves on our wrists, put there by the trusts and combines of the manufacturers; and to whom does the Prime Minister fly for a certificate of character? To Mr. Gurney, who is not only a great manufacturer, but the head of the greatest trust on this continent, the stove trust. (Hear, hear.) It is very like a man who has posed as a saint going to the master of the infernal regions for a certificate of his purity. (Cheers and laughter.)

Well, Sir, we expected to see some evidence in the speech that we would get tariff reform. We expected to see something about coal oil; we expected to see an announcement from the Minister of the Interior that we would have a Bill bearing on Dominion lands, which would get rid of the odd sections in the Northwest Territories, which also the hon. gentleman promised us at Moosomin. We expected to see something about the Hudson's Bay Railway. But not one of these things is to be found in the Speech. Now, is it a wrong thing to hold public men to their pledges? I am sorry the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) is not here, but I am going to quote him.

Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper. Where did he go?

Mr. Davin. Oh, I think he thought that I might deal with him. The Minister of Trade and Commerce is not here to hear it, but the country's ear is open, and to-morrow morning the country will hear what the hon. gentleman said. On page 183 of a pamphlet of speeches published in 1878, Mr. Cartwright, as he then was said:

Mr. Wood (Hamilton). Why go back so far as that?

Mr. Davin. Are they afraid of their utterances Mr. Speaker? This is a statement of a general truth that I am going to quote, and I ask the attention of my hon. friend from Hamilton to it:

"I say that it is our duty to stamp the mark of public reprobation, as I do, on men who have proved out of their own mouths thus false to the high trusts you committed to their hands."

Well, Mr. Speaker, is it necessary for me to quote the promises made by the Prime Minister to reduce the tariff to take the duty off coal; to take the duty off coal oil or to greatly reduce it; to relieve the agriculturists as regards implements? It is not necessary; they are well known; and to refer to them and point to this speech is to make the greatest possible condemnation of the Prime Minister and his colleagues. But, Sir, I am not going to content myself with that. I will not go so far back as 1878. I have something very interesting here. If you examine, as I have lately done, the tariff as it was in 1881, you will find that within a fraction it is very much the same as the tariff of to-day. The tariff of to-day, in regard to many things a poor man buys, is higher than that of 1881. Now, I ask your attention to this language, referring to the tariff of 1881:

"The N. P. imposed a rate of duties that largely increases the cost of sugar, that increases the cost of stoves and hardware, that increases the cost of ploughs and all agricultural implements, that makes cottons and woollens dearer than would have been the case under the previous tariff, and that benefits a few individuals at the expense of the masses. To show, for instances, how the Canadian farmer is made 'to pay for his whistle' by the present tariff,—"

This is as true of this tariff as of the tariff of which it was written:

"—we may adopt an illustration of a day's work and life on a farm,

"which cannot be questioned on the ground of accuracy. The farmer starting to his work has a shoe put on his horse with nails taxed 41 per cent, with a hammer taxed 40 per cent, cuts a stick with a knife taxed 27 1-2 per cent, hitches his horse to a plough taxed 30 per cent, with chains taxed 27 1-2 per cent. He returns to his home at night and lays his weary limbs on a sheet taxed 30 per cent, and covers himself with a blanket that has paid 70 per cent. He rises in the morning, puts on his humble flannel shirt taxed 60 per cent, shoes taxed 30 per cent, hat taxed 30 per cent, reads a chapter from his Bible taxed 7 per cent.—" I believe that tax is now off. I remember that it was said of a lawyer who used to drive a very hard bill, that before he sat down to write it he said his prayers.

"—and kneels to his God on a cheap carpet taxed 30 per cent. He sits down to breakfast: eats from a plate taxed 40 per cent, with knife and fork taxed 30 per cent, drinks his cup of coffee or tea sweetened with sugar taxed 45 per cent, seasons his food with salt taxed 35 per cent, pepper 35 per cent, or spice 35 per cent. He looks around upon his wife and children, all taxed in the same way—"

Now, mark this, and I call the attention of the First Minister to it—

"—takes a chew of tobacco taxed 100 per cent—"

Well, tobacco is higher now; I suppose it is taxed 125 per cent.

"—and if he indulges in a cigar he has first to pay a tax of 120 per cent, and then he is expected to thank John A. that he lives under the freest Government under heaven."

What we would write down now is that he is expected to thank Sir Wilfrid Laurier that he lives under a Government that keeps everyone of its pledges.

Now, as bearing on that topic, let me show you this illustration, and I may tell you that it is one which has created some feeling throughout

the  
not  
toba  
side  
pure  
This  
here  
you,  
plug  
the  
the  
solid  
and  
the  
sam  
poll  
The  
sour  
but  
Libe  
the  
will  
whit  
ing  
Le  
whi  
Libe  
"Ta  
the  
the  
in 1  
den  
pan  
ver  
"  
"Po  
"le  
"co  
We  
Wh  
san  
sel  
gra  
goe  
"  
"ev  
"to  
Wh  
the  
an  
me  
key  
wh  
tax  
"  
"t  
"I



the Northwest Territories. There is not a shop in the Territories where tobacco is sold, in which the man inside the counter does not say to the purchaser: Which will you have? This is the Conservative plug, and here is the Liberal plug. I now show you, Mr. Speaker, a specimen of each plug and can anyone be surprised that the customer should say: Give me the Conservative plug for that is a solid plug. Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is, and just compare it with the other—the Liberal plug. Well, there is the same difference between the Liberal policy and the Conservative policy. The Conservative policy is solid and sound and what it professes to be, but the Liberal policy is just as that Liberal plug of tobacco—too light, and the people will not have it. Neither will they long stand the light weight which these gentlemen are now dealing out to them.

Let me read further from this, which was the campaign sheet of the Liberal party in 1882. It is headed "Taxes"—and mark you, Mr. Speaker, the present Government have kept the tariff about the same as it was in 1881, which they then so vigorously denounced, as you will see by this pamphlet. Here is what I find at the very start in this pamphlet:

"Taxes.—Sir John, by his National Policy, committed himself to the policy of levying taxes on grain and coal."

Well, we can likewise say that Sir Wilfrid Laurier, by retaining that same tariff today, has committed himself to the policy of levying taxes on grain and coal. Then the pamphlet goes on:

"Such a tax has raised the price of every ton of coal the poor man has to buy."

Why, we know it has, especially we the Northwest where fuel is dear and scarce; and these hon. gentlemen opposite have consequently not kept their promise to the poor man, when, by their tariff, they retain this tax. I further read:

"The tax on coal has also increased the cost of production. An increase in the cost of production reduces

"the profits of manufacturers—a reduction of their profits lowers the rate of the workingman's wages. It at the same time raises the price of fuel to the workingman, as the tax on wheat has raised the price of his bread. Sir John's policy, then, weakens home manufactures, lowers the rate of wages, and increases the cost of living."

Well, that is the language in which the Liberal party denounced a tariff which was practically the same as the tariff we now have. (Cheers.) We know what they have done about cotton. They condemned, when in Opposition, in the strongest possible manner, the tariff on cotton, and yet they have, when in office, raised the duty on the poor man's cotton. In view of these circumstances, is it to be supposed that the farmers of the Northwest, or the farmers of this country generally, can be content? How can they be content when they find that promise after promise has been belied? We were promised in the Northwest, and we took great stock in the promise, that the expenditure would be lowered. But what has taken place? The expenditure has been raised by \$1,400,000. I shall not give you all the items, but only those that most concerns us in the Territories. I must again express my regret at not seeing the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) in his place, because I intend bringing something before the House which interests him, and which, if he will not answer here, he will have to answer later before Canada. He promised to reduce the expenditure in the management of the Indian Department, and he took away from Regina the Indian Commissioner's Office, on the pretence that he would thereby lower the expenditure. He also dismissed men wholesale from the Indian Department on the same pretence. But what are the facts? At this moment, in 1897, the cost of running the Indian Department is \$17,000 higher than it was in 1896. How is he going to get over that? I would like to have him here to explain, but I suppose he will, if I may quote one of the figures used

by the right hon. First Minister, hide his head in the sand like the ostrich, and kick out at the stars, at gods, and men, vainly supposing that such tactics will save him from popular reprobation. (Laughter and cheers.)

Let me take one or two other items. The interest on the debt has been increased by \$143,000; the cost of the militia has been increased \$530,000, and the Mounted Police—what do you think has been done with regard to that? The policy which the Government has adopted with regard to the Mounted Police leaves the Northwest Territories at this moment in great peril. The ranchers out there are in great excitement because the word has gone out to take the Mounted Police from Fort Macleod and Calgary up to the Klondyke. The policy of reducing the Mounted Police has had the effect of alarming the people of the Northwest, and left the Government, too, when they wanted men for the Klondyke, in a tight and difficult place. They reduced the Mounted Police, one of the finest forces in the Empire, by 150 men, and how much do you suppose they saved? They save just \$6,000. They ought to have saved \$150,000, because their calculation was that each man cost \$1,000. But instead of saving \$800 or \$1,000 per man, they saved only \$6,000 altogether, and reduced the force by 150 men.

But I must hark back again to the tariff, because I see the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Jameson) has come in, and I wish to remind the House that that hon. gentleman expressed his disappointment with his own Government last summer, and should like to hear what he has to say here on the same subject. They had a meeting in Winnipeg, at which the hon. gentleman attended, and at which he told a doleful tale. He told them that when he and his fellow-Liberals from the West tried to get a reduction on implements they found that it was not they, the representatives of the farming provinces, who had the ear of the Government, but Mr. Frost and the other implement

makers. (Cries of "hear, hear" and "Oh" from the Opposition.)

I want to call the attention especially of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) to the fact that the expenditure has been greatly increased, and that consequently in this respect neither have the Government kept their word. I want to show what is said by some of their own supporters on that point. You will remember, Sir, that the "Gleaner," which is a supporter of the Government, called attention to the strong utterances of the Minister of Trade and Commerce in favor of keeping down expenditure. The "Gleaner" then showed what the expenditure was; it showed that the expenditure had increased to \$4,000,000, and quoting the strong language of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, it denounced him for not carrying out his pledges especially in the absence of Sir Wilfrid Laurier. The "Gleaner" did more than that. It went over the conduct of the Liberal party and condemned that party. There cannot be the least doubt that whether we look at the expenditure or at the way we have been treated in the matter of tariff, or whether we take promise after promise, not a syllable of any of the promises made in Opposition has been implemented by hon. gentlemen in office. (Opposition cheers.)

Take another promise that was given us—the maintenance of the purity of Parliament. Why Sir, has there ever been such a scandalous violation of the independence of Parliament as was witnessed in this House in the conduct of Langelier? To make the position of judge a football of party exigencies was bad enough, for it was calculated to lower the character and dignity of the judicial office, but to take the Lieutenant Governor's position and treat it in the same way was, I hold, derogatory to the dignity of the Crown. Again, these gentlemen were going to give us purity of administration. Why, Sir, you cannot speak of it without laughing. I do not see the minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) in his place, that apostle of purity, the

gen  
chie  
cau  
for  
gen  
sha  
fore  
he  
gen  
kno  
par  
the  
A  
M  
che  
ing  
wa  
the  
the  
ter  
and  
tho  
tha  
the  
are  
the  
sin  
er.  
it  
the  
to  
in  
pis  
ch  
dy  
Li  
ju  
ru  
to  
Bu  
ol  
te  
ev  
th  
de  
no  
T  
er  
G  
c  
w  
i  
V  
d  
t



gentleman who declared that Green-shields was a man and a brother because he gave \$30,000 to buy a paper for the Minister's son, (laughter) the gentleman who does not see anything shameful in what, when he was before the court in the Grenier matter, he declared on oath he had done, a gentleman who, I believe, does not know the conscience of the Liberal party. The conscience of the bulk of the Liberal party is sound.

An Hon. Member—Hear, hear.

Mr. Davin—I am glad to hear that cheer. There may be gentlemen looking for positions who are as Langelier was here, who have their letters in their pockets and who, by-and-by, if they are not met, will shake those letters in the face of the Prime Minister and make him toe the mark. But though there may be such men, I say that the heart and the conscience of the Liberal party throughout Canada are sound, and they are outraged by the fearful spectacle presented ever since the Government came into power. (Hear, hear) From the moment it took office until the present time the Government has gone from bad to worse, sinking deeper and deeper in ring after ring that smells with piscatorial effluvia. (Laughter and cheers.) And now we have this Klondyke deal as it is called. When the Liberal party was in power before just as now, they began to grow corrupt. And not only that, they began to have differences among themselves. But, Sir, no act of corruption of the old Liberal Government, not the Foster affair, not the Neebing Hotel, not even the Steel Rails amounted to anything compared with the Drummond deal, the Crow's Nest Pass deal, and now this gigantic Klondyke affair. This last has all the appearance of an enormous trust of which the Government are a part. You cannot look at it for a moment without seeing that there are millions in it for more than one. (Hear, hear.) With the money in this Klondyke deal they can buy up the whole country from Halifax to Vancouver. (Hear,

hear.) It is an attempt to raise money to cover past indebtedness in the late election—you see I know something about our affairs. It is intended to put half a million here, and half a million there, and half a million elsewhere—I do not know for whom, but there is more than one "boy," you may be perfectly certain in this. It is intended to make a corruption fund for the next general election.

Mr. Bennett—How much for Hardy?

Mr. Davin—And something, I suppose, for Hardy. (Laughter.) But let me say, Sir, with some experience as a politician, that you cannot win an election with money alone.

The Prime Minister, (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Hear, hear.

Mr. Davin—My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) laughs. He knows right well that you cannot win an election with money alone, for all the money that Mercier gave him for New Brunswick and elsewhere did not enable him to win that election of 1891. (Cheers.) I have just said that differences arose in the Liberal party when it was previously in office. But they were nothing to those of the present time, just as the corruption of the party when it was in power is nothing to the corruption of the present time. But let me say that it probably does not come home as close to the right hon. gentleman, as it would have come to the leader in Mackenzie's time. As I understand it, the right hon. gentleman has adopted what is called the English Cabinet system, a system that the late Sir John Macdonald leaned to latterly though for the greater part of his ministerial life Sir John carried on Government as the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) said once, Government by order of Council, that is to say, he kept a string on his Ministers, he kept a certain check upon them, and in that way he kept things pretty straight. But the present Premier follows the system that prevails in England. He holds a Minister responsible for his department, and then

says to the country: This man is in charge of this department, he is responsible, and the Prime Minister gives him a free hand. What is the result? He has taken in, for instance, the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) with ten years' reputation for corruption in New Brunswick, such as no Provincial Minister ever had, and he has given him a department in which he may plunge his arms, not up to the elbows merely, but up to the shoulders in the public treasury. (Opposition cheers.) Although the hands of the Prime Minister may be clean, though he may have in regard to these things the poor virtue of clean fingers, yet morally before the people of Canada he is responsible for what these people do. There is the Minister of the Interior with energy very useful to his friends, but whose rashness and inexperience have been strikingly illustrated in Indian affairs and the Klondyke. (Cheers.) We were taunted, he had the audacity to taunt us here with divisions amongst ourselves. This from a party, the wing of whose army which is strongest and on which the Prime Minister most leans is honeycombed with internecine jealousies and torn to pieces with internecine strife. (Hear, hear.) Let me read a picture by a great hand of what has been going on in Quebec. This is from a paper which I am sure will be an authority with every man in this House. The article is headed: "A Bundle of Sticks," and this is the picture it gives of the Liberal party in Quebec.

An hon. Member—What paper?

Mr. Davin—The "Star," an independent paper. This is what it says:

"When there were rumors the other day of war between Norway and Sweden, we could not help feeling a pang of pity for his unhappy Majesty, the King of Sweden and Norway. It must be a painful thing for a monarch to have to declare war against a brother monarch; but it must be particularly painful when the other monarch is himself. The only sovereign who could act in this dual capacity gracefully is the Ger-

man Emperor. He is about the only great general who could successfully lead a cavalry charge against himself, and at the same time form himself into a hollowsquare to receive the charge.

"But we have something like this anomalous state of affairs in the present condition of the great Liberal party of this province. What is the Liberal party of this province if not the party of Tarte, Prefontaine and Beausoleil, the party of Stephens, Guerin, Rainville and Bickerdike? This is the party that has not only proclaimed war against itself, but is prosecuting the war most vigorously. The elements of union are by no means lacking, for we have Tarte and Beausoleil marching together shoulder to shoulder in a punitive expedition against Prefontaine. If Prefontaine is to be Mayor, then Tarte and Beausoleil will know the reason why. Mr. Prefontaine is threatened with an expensive campaign, when, but for his Liberal friends, he might have had an election by acclamation. But this does not prevent his forming an offensive alliance with Mr. Tarte for the purpose of ousting Mr. Beausoleil from the representation of the East Ward. And although Mr. Beausoleil will have to fight like the doughty warrior he is to save his own seat, it does not prevent him joining heartily with Mr. Prefontaine in the siege of the Hon. Joseph Israel Tarte in the Department of Public Works. (Laughter.)

"It requires a war map to follow all the complications of this most interesting fight in detail. But the offensive alliances may be briefly summed up as follows: Tarte and Beausoleil against Prefontaine; Prefontaine and Beausoleil against Tarte; Tarte and Prefontaine against Beausoleil. Was anything ever like it out of comic opera? The only hope of an early termination of this most complicated warfare seems to be in the intervention of some friendly powers. When Rainville and George Washington Stephens get

"throu  
"Queb  
"will  
"may  
"Mea  
"Ing  
"solei  
"they  
"nize  
"distr  
"Will  
"whe  
"cheer  
Now,  
the s  
by an  
are t  
Minis  
there  
this p  
gests  
amon  
a ske  
think  
party  
tary  
of th  
—the  
(laug  
the  
at th  
erly-  
why,  
it w  
have  
in th  
hous  
laug  
Mr  
the  
fact  
occa  
in u  
tion  
can  
refer  
I f  
Bra  
"  
"an  
" "  
"co  
"di  
"M  
M  
it f

"through pummelling each other at Quebec, and Bickerdike and Guerin will allow one another to get up, they may be able to interfere effectively. Meanwhile, it is awfully embarrassing for Tarte, Prefontaine and Beau-soileil. When any two of them meet, they do not know whether to fraternize or "shoot at sight," and their "distressed commander-in-chief, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, hasn't the least idea where he is at." (Great laughter and cheers.)

Now, Sir, that is a good picture of the state of things in Quebec, given by an artist on the spot; and yet we are told by the hon. gentleman who is Minister of Trade and Commerce that there were great dissensions amongst this party. The Minister of Trade suggests that there were skeletons amongst us. Well, Sir, there may be a skeleton in our party; I should think it a very odd thing if a large party could be found without a solitary skeleton. But, Sir, on that side of the House, because we know it well—there is a whole dissecting-room; (laughter and cheers) and I have not the least doubt that if we can get at the facts, and probe them properly—take this Klondyke business—why, if we can probe that, and probe it well, we will find that not merely have they a whole dissecting-room, but in that one particular deal a charnel-house of corruption. (Cheers and laughter.)

Mr. Speaker—I would like to draw the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that he has been on two or three occasions somewhat unparliamentary in using so freely the term "corruption." It is not a term which, I think, can be bandied across the House with reference to individual members at all. I find it stated in Denison's and Brand's decisions that:

"An hon. member having spoken of "another hon. member as having been "detected in the grossest practice of "corruption" is called upon to withdraw the word."

Mr. Davin—"Detected."

Mr. Speaker—"Detected" or "guilty," it is exactly the same thing. The hon.

gentleman certainly would not accuse an hon. member of being guilty unless he supposed he had been detected. So I see no difference in the cases. I hope the hon. gentleman will have some regard to that rule.

Mr. Davin—I agree with your ruling, Mr. Speaker. May I ask you, Mr. Speaker, as a favor to show me how I have offended against that ruling?

Mr. Speaker—The hon. gentleman has thrown charges of corruption across the House this afternoon on several occasions. The hon. gentleman accused the Minister of Railways of having been for ten years, I think he said, a notorious corruptionist in New Brunswick—or words almost to that effect. That is quite out of order. Had I drawn the attention of the hon. gentleman to it at the time, as I probably should have done. I would have required him to withdraw them.

Mr. Davin—Of course, if I have said anything unparliamentary, I desire to withdraw it. I wish to bow entirely to your ruling, but do I understand that it is wrong to say that if we could probe this Klondyke matter thoroughly we would find ourselves in a charnel-house of corruption? Is that unparliamentary?

Mr. Speaker—If the hon. gentleman referred to any individual member of the House as being guilty of corruption he would be out of order. General terms like that might be admissible, but I am speaking of their application to individual members.

Mr. Davin—Now, I am going to read the words of a former leader of yours, and a former leader of the Prime Minister, words that will apply to that Klondyke affair, fit it pat. I have doubt that they will be received with the respect that they deserve. I hope that it is not unparliamentary to say that there is about that Klondyke matter a strong piscatorial effluvia. (Much Laughter.)

Mr. Speaker.—Of course, I do not think it is at all unparliamentary for the hon. gentleman to endeavor to fly over the heads of the House.

Mr. Davin.—I assure you, Mr. Spea-



ker, that I do not want to fly over their heads, I want to reach their hearts if I can. I am aiming as far as I can, to produce in some repentance, and I am also seeking for others enlightenment. My aim, Sir, is to make converts in this House, and converts outside; and I may tell you, Mr. Speaker, that within the last twelve months, and I am sure you will be glad to know it, my missionary efforts in seeking to bring people out of political darkness into political light, have been most successful. (Cheers.) Now, one of the things I object to in that Klondyke business, is its secrecy, I say there is no reason for making a secret contract. I condemn also the policy of hurrying it on also on the eve of the meeting of parliament, signing a contract when you could have either delayed it for a week, or else called Parliament to meet three or four weeks earlier, and lay it before Parliament. I object to having Parliament dethroned. I object to having Parliament deprived of its functions and supervision and scrutiny, and I object most strenuously to the monopoly. I object most strenuously to the tremendous price paid, 25,000 acres per mile, 25,000 acres instinct with gold, pregnant with gold, for building a railway that will not be able to do the work. Mark me, the railway that has been described by the Minister of Railways, will not be able to do the work that is necessary to be done over that country. Now, listen to what the Hon. Edward Blake said, and it will fit pat to this affair:

"They pride themselves on the Pacific Coast contract."

I do not know that we could with truth say that they pride themselves on their MacKenzie & Mann contract. I do not think that they are very proud of it. The Minister of Railways, when he was introducing his bill yesterday, presented the most extraordinary spectacle I ever saw, and I have had some experience in parliamentary life. I never in my life before saw a man introduce a bill and get violently an-

gry with some imaginary opponent, hit out right and left, flame up purple red with indignation at some critics that rose before his inflamed fancy, and do a lot of boxing in anticipation of the fight that was to take place three or four days ahead. I know that there are timid men on this side. (Laughter.) I know that the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) is a man of some timidity (laughter), and of course the timidity of the leader of the Opposition is well known, the timidity of the old war-horse of Cumberland is notorious. (Laughter.) I know well that it was calculated to frighten them; but I may tell you, Mr. Speaker—and I have no doubt the House on both sides will hear this with gratification—I have spoken since with the leader of the Opposition, with the member for York, and with the late Minister of Railways, and I find that although their nerves were slightly disturbed for a time, they are now convalescent and in a normal condition. (Laughter.) Well, this is the language of Edward Blake:

"I condemn that bargain as improper, being made in secret, without public tender, contrary to the existing policy of the people and of Parliament, and opposed to the provisions of the law.

"I condemn it as extravagant, since the enterprise will cost us \$60,000,000 and 25,000,000 acres of the choicest lands, while the road is to belong to the company, which will realize the cost of its part of the work out of its land and money subsidies.

"I condemn it as outrageous, in conferring on the company a practical monopoly, for twenty years, of the trade of our Northwest Territories, and large privileges and exemptions, very valuable to them and still more detrimental to the public.

"I condemn it as indefensible, being consummated in the face of a tender to perform the same obligations for \$3,000,000 less money, for 3,000,000 acres less land, without the monopoly of trade, without the exemptions from taxation, and on other condi-

"tions  
"those  
Why  
the v  
Blake  
demn  
(chee  
oppos  
not e  
respon  
name  
Oppos  
pers  
you v  
here  
that  
yer t  
a cha  
conne  
have  
aid M  
this r  
"  
"you  
"and  
"wha  
So  
for th  
Char  
the v  
Char  
with  
Mr  
tion  
Mr  
mak  
suga  
East  
man  
He  
he d  
to t  
mad  
Com  
tod  
som  
sav  
his  
vic  
in  
by  
me  
at  
po  
co  
are

"tions much more favorable than those of the contract."

Why, Mr. Speaker, I condemn on the very grounds stated by Hon. Mr. Blake, and the country will also condemn, that Klondyke contract, (cheers), and I tell hon. gentlemen opposite that a policy of silence will not enable them to escape from their responsibility (Renewed cheers.) The name of my leader, the leader of the Opposition, was connected by the papers with this Klondyke matter, and you will remember, Sir, it was stated here by the leader of the Opposition that he had telegraphed to his lawyer to sue "La Presse" for making a charge against him as having been connected with the transaction. I have here a letter written by Mr. Donald Macmaster, Q. C., in respect to this matter. It is as follows:

" 'La Presse' says it loyally accepts 'your statement made in the House, and expresses regret for having said 'what it did.'"

So that "La Presse" has apologized for the charge made against Sir Charles Tupper, and that sweeps to the winds the assertion that Sir Charles was in any way connected with that Klondyke deal. (Cheers.)

Mr. Britton—Where is the contradiction from the "World?"

Mr. Davin—The "World" did not make any charge; it merely made a suggestion. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) is a cautious man and an experienced journalist. He may tremble on the threshold, but he does not rush in where angels fear to tread. In connection with a boast made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, which was referred to here today. I want to call attention to some of his own words. Today he saw the right hon. Premier and one of his colleagues introduce one of the victors at the by-elections. We had in that extraordinary reply, delivered by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, a statement that the victories at the by-elections were evidences of popular confidence of the party in the country. I have here a speech delivered by the Minister of Trade and

Commerce in 1892, and there is in it a paragraph headed "Unexampled Successes," and it has references altogether to by-elections. What did he then say? He stated that the success of the Government in the by-elections is no indication whatever of the feeling throughout the country, because, he says, what is perfectly true in Canada, that the advantages of the Government in the by-elections are so great that fighting the Government is equivalent to meeting a man who is playing with loaded dice.

Sir Charles Tupper—Whose speech was that?

Mr. Davin—It was delivered by the present Minister of Trade and Commerce. He said:

"Yet, nevertheless, with all these 'things against them, we find the 'Government sustained at all points 'throughout Ontario, and absolutely 'winning 18 out of 20 by-elections. Sir, 'the mere statement of those figures 'is in itself enough. Does any sane 'human being who knows anything at 'all of the conditions of political life 'believe for one moment that this result was obtained by honest means? 'The thing is an absurdity. Those 'figures carry condemnation on the 'very face of them. 'As well defend 'Sodom.' As well say that it is possible to cast double sixes eighteen 'times out of twenty. Sir, it is only 'possible on one condition, and on one 'only—that the dice are loaded."

So, the hon. gentleman said, whenever a Government wins by elections in great numbers, the dice are loaded. But we had an election recently in Ontario, which was significant. It was an election in Centre Toronto, which sends here as its representative a large manufacturer, who made a defence of the Government in a peculiar way. The hon. gentleman defended the Ministry, and I am bound to say that while he was delivering his maiden speech in this House there was not a blush on his cheek; I watched him closely and there was not the slightest change in his complexion, but there was a hesitancy in his speech when he faltered out the

statement that the Government had kept their promises. It is of course supremely in his interest and in those of the manufacturers he represents that the assertion should be forced down the throats of the constituencies that election promises have been kept. What is the significance of that election? Does it mean that Toronto supports the Government? The hon. gentleman himself believes in preferential trade; he had to lift the Conservative banner in order to win that constituency. He unfurled the banner of preferential trade; and I must say that I do not know where his own leader is under that banner as I shall show in a moment, but at all events the hon. member for Centre Toronto raised the banner of preferential trade. Not only so, but no doubt he told the people, just as he told the House the other day that the Liberal party—I am not going to labor this point because it has been well covered by other speakers—never professed free trade but only a reduction of the tariff. We had, however, the eloquent language of the Prime Minister in Winnipeg, on which occasion he stated that he was for free trade as it is in England. I am calling attention to the significance of the recent Toronto election. That constituency originally was a Liberal one. First, in 1872 Robert Wilkes defeated one of the most popular Tories in Canada, Frank Shanty, by a majority of 182. In 1874 he defeated that popular citizen, Angus Morrison, by a majority of 382. In 1875 Mr. John Macdonald was elected by acclamation. In 1878 we had to put up a Liberal, Robert Hay, who was at one with us on the National Policy, in order to win the seat. In 1882 Mr. Hay was again returned. In 1887 and 1891 Mr. Cockburn carried the constituency. Then Mr. Lount carried it by a majority of 240. Next it was carried by my hon. friend, (Mr. Bertram) by a majority of 250. I must say to my hon. friend that it was a small majority, and I will tell him why. It was a small majority because he is an ideal candidate for that constituency; he is

a good speaker on the platform; he is a successful manufacturer and commercial man, and he waved the Conservative banner as he went before his constituency. Out of nine contests five Liberals were returned and four Conservatives, and Centre Toronto may thus fairly be claimed to be a Liberal constituency. With two Liberal Governments, the Dominion and the Ontario Government working for my hon. friend, instead of his having a majority about equal to that secured by Mr. Lount, who was not an ideal candidate, he being a lawyer, he should have had 1,000 majority. (Hear, hear) What were the facts in regard to that contest? This Klondyke deal had some connection with the Centre Toronto contest. One of the leading men in the Klondyke deal had put up money to enable the constituency to be carried by the Liberal, and the whole thing had been arranged to return the present member by acclamation, but the young Liberal-Conservatives became alarmed. (Cheers.) If they had gone into the field in time, and if that magnificent speech made by my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) (Cheers) on Saturday night that great battle note of economy showing up the dreadful fall of the Liberal party from its principles if that speech had been made one week earlier, I believe—much as I am pleased with seeing my hon. friend (Mr. Bertram)—here I would have been still more pleased to have seen my friend (Mr. Howland) representing that constituency. (Cheers.)

I have quoted the statement of the Minister of Trade and Commerce that it was a proper thing to hold men to their utterances, and now I want to deal with what I deem to be the most serious charge against the Government, and that is their conduct and the conduct of the Prime Minister in regard to preferential trade. I never heard a more complete indictment made in my life, in a court of justice or anywhere else, than was made by the leader of the Opposition the other night in this House in connection with



this question. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) replied to the leader of the Opposition and to the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster). Did the Minister prove that any statement made by these two gentlemen was unfounded? Not at all. But he thought it a sufficient thing to say indirectly that the leader of the Opposition was would have preferred him to Ananias, a liar, for he said if he had been in Jerusalem 1900 years ago, Sapphira

Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper—And he was not called to order, either.

Mr. Davin—There is no calling to order under these circumstances. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have known the leader of the Opposition politically, and personally also, for thirty years, and I say that there is not a man who can stand up and show that any statement of fact ever made by that hon. gentleman was unfounded. (Cheers) The only charge I ever heard made against him with the least color of foundation was that he was too hopeful of the Northwest for it was contended that the Northwest did not come up to his anticipations. Let me in this connection refer to that part of the Queen's Speech which mentions the Northwest. Why, Sir, the farmers are rolling in wealth now in the Northwest Territories. About Indian Head, Regina, Moose Jaw, Moosomin, all over the Territories and over Manitoba, too, the farmers of the Northwest are rolling in wealth, and banking sums varying from \$1,000 to \$15,000 clear profit on individual farms. That is the country which my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) has opened up and was so hopeful about. The leader of the Opposition quoted the language of the Prime Minister at London, at Toronto and elsewhere, and also his conduct at London and at Liverpool, and he made the charge that the Prime Minister did not properly represent Canada—not in demeanor—but in connection with the grave business that presented itself. The Minister of Trade and Commerce met that charge by saying by implication, that the

leader of the Opposition was a liar, but does he suppose for one moment the people of Canada, or the Liberals of Canada will accept any such reply as that? The Minister of Trade and Commerce boasted of cutting the Gordian knot, and the Prime Minister boasted that the Gordian knot was cut. Why, Sir, both of them forgot, that they declared from their seats there, that there was no Gordian knot to cut, and the Prime Minister when he went to England said so. And, when all these things are pressed home to these gentlemen, they content themselves with making a few jokes and having recourse to metaphor. Sir, the thing is too grave to be allowed to slip by like that, and I wish to call the attention of the House and of the country to the state of the preferential trade question at this moment. When the Prime Minister was seeking power he declared at London that he was in favor of preferential trade, that Mr. Chamberlain was in favor of it also, and that he (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) if he got into power was going to get us preferential trade. He made the same declaration at Montreal and at Toronto, and he made it at St. Johns, P. Q., also, and this illustrates a very peculiar feature of the right hon. gentleman. The way in which he made the declaration at St. Johns, P. Q., may be an explanation of the extraordinary position he is in today, because I cannot believe for one minute that the Prime Minister would wilfully falsify, and my theory of the position the Prime Minister is in is this: That out of perfect lightness of heart and a desire to say what is pleasant on all occasions, he went and said (because he found it was popular all over Canada) that he was in favor of preferential trade. Now, it has been shown that the Prime Minister contradicted himself in this matter, and I am going to show that such is his levity of mind when he was leading a great party and seeking power, in the same speech almost in the same breath, he made the same contradiction that is on record as between his utterance in Liver-

pool and his utterance in London. I have here his speech made in St. Johns in the Province of Quebec, in July 7th, 1896. He said:

"Today your principal market is the 'British market. It is possible for us 'to make an arrangement by which 'England will give us market for all 'our products if we give something 'like reciprocity to certain British 'products. I am for that policy."

There is preferential trade with England for you, but mark what he says in the next paragraph:

"We can be on good terms with everybody, and that is the thing we have 'set before us. If we establish good 'relations with the United States, we 'may perhaps have the benefit of the 're-opening of the negotiations, and the 'renewal of the treaty of reciprocity."

Here in the same breath, in two contiguous paragraphs of his speech the Prime Minister declares he is for preferential trade and for unrestricted reciprocity. The contradictions that have been pointed out by the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) and by my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) are thrown in the shade completely by this contradiction made in the same speech, (cheers) and it explains what otherwise is almost inexplicable: the extraordinary contradictions which arise in the utterances of the Prime Minister. I have studied the right hon. gentleman and analysed him carefully, and I believe these contradictions arise from the fact that he has not thought down to rock-bottom the great political questions of the day, and founded principles thereon. There is no stability of principles there and his amiable facile nature leads him to say pleasant words on all occasions. Of course, that is very nice, but it is not desirable in a leader of a party, or for a politician, speaking on great questions. I really fear that if my right hon. friend had to address an audience of rats, he would say to them that he took a great interest in rodents, that they were the most interesting of quadrupeds, and he would not mind taking them into his confidence and assuring them that he

himself had a penchant for cheese. (Laughter and cheers.)

The right hon. gentleman quoted from Mr. Chamberlain, and very curiously enough the quotation showed that Mr. Chamberlain was at one with himself, as he spoke in London. He said in London that he was in favor of a revenue tariff, and that a revenue tariff and preferential trade would go well together. Mr. Chamberlain, in the quotation which the right hon. gentleman made from his speech, said that there would have to be a modification of the tariffs of the colonies, and it would have to go in the direction of a revenue tariff; and we all agree that there would have had to be a modification.

Now, the Minister of Trade and Commerce declared that there was a great difficulty in bringing about a denunciation of the treaties. The hon. gentleman is either trying to bamboozle this House and this country, or he is grossly ignorant of the state of opinion in England at that time. The movement had been in existence in England for years. My hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) not only found a strong feeling existing in England in favor of preferential trade, but he helped to increase it, and he knows very well that that feeling existed not merely among the statesmen of England, but amongst the farmers and merchants all over the country. There was a going-out toward preferential trade; (Hear, hear,) and our charge against the Prime Minister is not that he killed the movement—because I do not believe that he could kill it—but that he dazed and staggered it for the time being. He hit it a deadly blow, but I do not believe he knocked the life out of it. Now, Lord Salisbury has been quoted and Mr. Chamberlain has been quoted; but I am going to quote to you not only what Lord Salisbury said, but what the Right Hon. Arthur Balfour said in regard to that subject, and it is very important. I am not only going to show you what Mr. Balfour said, but what was taking place all over England, of which these gentlemen seem perfectly ignorant. On

the eve of the Jubilee there was hardly a nook in England where, in mechanics' institutes, and in various little literary societies this question of preferential trade was not discussed. I have here a report of one of those meetings—that of the South Wilts Chamber of Agriculture, which took place at Bath. At that meeting a Mr. J. W. Titt made a long argument in favor of preferential trade, and quoted the Right Hon. Arthur, among others, as follows:

"Should the colonies desire to adopt 'the policy of a customs union, and 'the treaties between Great Britain 'and Belgium and the Zollverein inter- 'pose obstacles in the way of the real- 'ization of such a desire, it would be 'the duty of Her Majesty's Govern- 'ment to consider how to remove 'those treaty restrictions and to shape 'their course accordingly."

You see that the Right Hon. Arthur Balfour regards preferential trade and the denunciation of those treaties as correlative—as bearing something the same relation to each other as a plate does to the meat you eat off it, (Hear, hear); and for any one of these hon. gentlemen to say: If we had asked for preferential trade, we would not have got the denunciation of the treaties, is something like a man who is invited to dinner saying, "I will eat your meat, but I will not have your plate," or, "I will take your plate, but I will be hanged if I will eat your meat," and then coming back and saying, "I got the plate, but I didn't get the meat; if I had asked for both the plate and the meat, I would not have got either." (Cheers.) Here is Mr. Arthur Balfour saying that the two things are correlative, and that one of the reasons for denouncing these treaties was, that they stood in the way of preferential trade. Now, Mr. Speaker, does any man who listens to it, believe for a moment that there is anything in the statement that it was difficult at that time to get these treaties denounced. Why Sir, for years many people were trying to get them denounced, and they were in this position. If you travel

through an Alpine country—through the Valley of Chamouni, for instance—you will see an avalanche above you, and the ligament that holds it has been worn away so much that a girl going through the valley and shouting or singing will so shake the avalanche that the ligament which holds it gives way and the avalanche comes down. That was precisely the position in which these treaties stood. The ligament that held them had been long wearing away. (Cheers.) Here is the quotation this man makes from Mr. Chamberlain:

"The colonists have with the mother 'country a common origin, a com- 'mon language, a common literature, 'a common love of liberty and law, 'common principles to assert and 'common interests to maintain."

Then he quotes the Earl of Rosebery, who is a charming and refined man, but I never thought that he was the figure for Romeo when he was made the leader of the Liberal party. Though he has recently given utterance to some things that I did not like on this subject, here is what he said in the quotation to which I refer:

"It is, as I believe, impossible for 'you to maintain in the long run your present loose relations to your coloni- 'es, and preserve those colonies as 'part of the Empire. I wish to say 'that on the grounds of commercial 'interests alone this question is wor- 'thy of the consideration of our great 'commercial communities."

Then he quoted the Marquis of Salisbury as far back as 1887. The question, which by the mere word of the Premier was swept away, was discussed as far back as 1887! And here is what the Marquis of Salisbury said in regard to it at that time:

"The Marquis of Salisbury, in a letter dated April 5, 1887, in reply to a 'correspondent, stated that 'he did not 'imagine that differential duties in 'favor of our colonies, whatever might 'be said for or against them, can be 'properly described in the term "pro- 'tection."

Showing in what direction his mind was going. This writer also quoted



a long article from the San Francisco "News-Letter," which showed how important this scheme of preferential trade was, and what a dangerous thing it was to the power of the United States. It said that it would make an Imperial United States of Great Britain, and give it an amplitude of power such as it never had before. And, Mr. Speaker, connected with this question is the question of defence, on which let me say one word. Why, Sir, any contribution which these colonies will have to make, by-and-by, towards the defence of the Empire will be a mere flea-bite. The same fleet will be needed for Imperial defense that is necessary for England to maintain at the present time. Then, Sir, at the meeting I speak of this resolution was proposed:

"That in the opinion of this chamber—the Chamber of Agriculture of Wiltshire—the commercial federation of Great Britain with all her colonies and possessions on a trade basis, giving preferential treatment to all within the Empire, is of the most supreme importance."

Mr. John Hall seconded that. He said he would never forgive himself if he allowed the motion to pass without seconding it, and if England wanted to keep her colonies she must have something more than sentiment to bind them to her. The Right Hon. gentleman says he knew the heart of John Bull. Why, here is John Bull himself—the farmers themselves—talking. Here we are at the heart of John Bull, in the great County of Wiltshire, and what the people there say is that they want something more than mere sentiment to bind the colonies to the Mother country. Lord Folkestone was present and supported the resolution, and Mr. Carpenter said:

"He had always been opposed to protection, but he should support the resolution in favor of the federation of the Empire."

What happened? The resolution was passed at that meeting unanimously.

Sir Charles Tupper—When was that?

Mr. Davin—On the eve of the Jubilee. It was an important event, and only one of many. It was held on May 22nd, 1896. That was the state of opinion all over England when the Right Hon. First Minister went across. England was then prepared for the very thing the right hon. gentleman subsequently declared for at London. I am not going to repeat in detail what happened, because we all know it. My right hon. friend went to Liverpool, the Duke of Devonshire held out to him his hand for preferential trade, and my right hon. friend put it rhetorically and scornfully aside. He said Canada did not want it, that what Canada gave was a free gift. At that time he had not made those speeches, the burden of which was *delenda est Carthago*, those speeches which were all for the denunciation of the treaties, because when he went to London and was interviewed, he told the "Chronicle" man: We say those treaties do not apply. So that on his visit to London during the Jubilee, that knot which he declared Alexander of Macedon had cut, he, the master of Alexander of Macedon, who is now before us, then said did not exist. (Cheers.) A change afterwards came over the spirit of his dream, but only when all the harm had been done. He went to Toronto on his return, and attended the banquet of the Board of Trade in that city, and there, where of course they were all preferential trade men, he did what he always does, and what illustrates my analysis of the right hon. gentleman—the only analysis creditable to him that I have been able to make of his character. Wherever he happens to be, he wants to say something pleasant; so that although he had in England declared that he did not want preferential trade, although he had in England accepted the Cobden Club medal, and the encomiums of Lord Farrer, who in presenting the medal laid stress on the opinions dear to the Cobden Club—although he had done all this, what did he say at Toronto? He said:

"It was said he should have demanded preferential trade from Great Britain as well as the getting rid of the obstructive treaties, but 'If he had asked for both he would have received neither. He had appealed, not to John Bull the man of business, but the man of big heart. 'One step had been gained, the step that first had to be gained, and if he had attempted more, it would have meant failure. The way was clear 'now to preferential trade, so soon as 'Great Britain was ready to grant it.' Why, we have the proof that not only were the statesmen of Great Britain ready to grant it, but that England herself, the great heart of John Bull, was beating for this preferential trade. (Cheers.) But what does the hon. gentleman tell us when he comes back? He comes back and tells the Board of Trade at Toronto that while he was the guest of these men, while accepting that Cobden medal, while enjoying their sumptuous hospitality, all his statements, his statement that Canada wanted nothing in return whatever, were all a piece of sly diplomacy, a piece of dexterous perfidy. (Cheers.) It pains me—and I say it unaffectedly—to find a First Minister of Canada playing such a role.

We have had during this debate, some very extraordinary and very strong literary comparisons. For instance, the leader of the Opposition has been compared to the scurrilous and unsightly Thersites. Now, when we take the course of the right hon. gentleman on this preferential trade question, there is a comparison that suggests itself, and I do not make it in any offensive sense. If you take the career of Milton's Satan, after he meets his followers in Pandemonium, and follow it from that out, you will find a most extraordinary similarity between it and the course of the right hon. gentleman. Satan's account to his followers of his exploits in duplicity, as recorded in "Paradise Lost," bears a remarkable similarity to my right hon. friend's account of his doings on the other side. I sup-

pose that, in all their readings, hon. gentlemen may have read the best known comedy of Foote. It is a comedy that was borrowed from the French, and the humor of it consists in this, that the hero gets himself, by reckless statements, into scrape after scrape; but still his confidence in his extraordinary resources, his imaginative power of concocting, is so great that he never doubts for one minute that he can lie himself out of any scrape that he gets into. Well, he was a feather-brained man of fashion; but you will remember that when the grand divan of demons takes place, as recorded in "Paradise Lost," Satan stands before them and declares he is going to deliver them out of hell, and that he will alone first explore the way. He meets Death and Sin, and, true to his policy, flatters them. Then he visits the country of Chaos and Old Night, and promises to reduce the new created world to darkness, which promise he has, of course, no intention of keeping. Then he meets the Angel of the Sun, to whom he represents himself as what he is not in order to gain certain information, and then he transforms himself completely, and is found at the ear of Eve whispering suggestions to her. In the assumed character of the Serpent, he assures her that he has eaten the forbidden fruit himself, which he has not, and that if she will eat of it, she will become a god, which he knows she will not. Then, when brought before Michael and charged with his unlawful intrusion into Paradise, he first says that his object was to fly from pain. When taunted with being the first to fly from pain he replies that that was not his reason, but that his object was to avoid hazarding his armies in untrod ways and first spy out himself the new created world. Now, mark the way Milton, the great Puritan poet, makes the Archangel Michael reply: "To say and straight unsay, pretending first

"Wise to fly pain, professing next the 'spy,

"Argues no leader, but a liar traced."

(Cheers).

Satan then returns to Pandemonium and boasts of what he has done, but in the midst of his boasting, his professions are belied by the degrading transformation which takes place, when he and all his followers are suddenly changed from angelic forms into hissing serpents. The leader is transformed into a serpent and his followers take his form, and looking at the kind of speeches we have listened to from the Minister of Commerce and the hon. member from Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram), it would seem as if these gentlemen had assumed the garb of dissimulation adopted by their leader and propose to rival him in duplicity. Now this is a most serious thing. Before quoting Mr. Chamberlain's last speech let me clinch this matter about the professions of free trade. I have here a dispatch from Montreal dated 30th November, which says that the "Star's" London cable says: That the Cobden Club is quite satisfied with the position of Sir Wilfrid Laurier. And this is the character they give him, a character that may be very useful to him, but I shall be glad to know how it will be received by the gentlemen who listened to his silver eloquence at the Board of Trade banquet at Toronto:

"In view of the adverse comments made in Canada and elsewhere on the fiscal policy of the Dominion Government, the committee think it right to state that they have reason to be satisfied that the present Administration at Ottawa is inspired by a genuine desire to advance on the lines of free exchange so far and as rapidly as possible, consistently with prudent regard for the difficulties created by the long rule of a high and comprehensive protective system."

Here, as late as November, the Cobden Club states that it was quite satisfied with the Prime Minister; and from this and from his utterance of last night, notwithstanding what his supporter from Toronto Centre said, he must be held to be opposed to preferential trade. (Hear, hear.) Still further to clinch this matter, I have

here the last speech made by Mr. Chamberlain. Take this in conjunction with that of the Right Hon. Arthur Balfour and with those of the Right Hon. Gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) himself, and with those of Lord Salisbury also, made before the Jubilee. As late as January, 1898, Mr. Chamberlain, speaking at Liverpool, declared in favor of closer union with the colonies. Speaking of the Jubilee, he said:

"It was the growth of an over-mastering and a universal desire in favor of closer union."

You will observe that, Sir. Of course as has been shown by what other hon. gentlemen have quoted in this House, and as I have further established by the opinions of these Wiltshire farmers, they were ready, in the glow and heat of that jubilee period to do more than meet us half-way if we had reached the hand to them. Mr. Chamberlain further says:

"It is not for us to take the initiative. We would rather follow the lead; but what I think I have already accomplished is to convince them that wherever they live, however far their home may be from the centre and from the mother land, we, at any rate, are prepared to meet them more than half-way in any proposal they may make to us (cheers), in any desire which they may express for their closer union (cheers); and, gentlemen, it will come (hear, hear), if not in our day, then in that of our successors."

Later on he says:

"But in whatever way it may be presented to us, we shall not be deterred either by the economic pedantries or the selfishness which is a virtue with some politicians from giving favorable consideration to any proposals which our brethren across the seas may make to us. And in such a consideration, I for one—"

I ask your attention to that—  
—do not believe the English people will keep a strict account of profit and loss." (Cheers).

So that today the sentiment is pre-



cisely the same as it was. And now, harking back to what I said before, the note throughout the British Empire at this moment is a note of colonial equality in the Imperial Union, and the men we have on the Treasury benches of Canada today cannot sound that note.

The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) attempted to reply to this statement made by the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) as to the effect of this tariff in discriminating against England. Why, Sir, the returns show it. The "Sun," of Toronto, pointed out what was shown by these late returns in reducing the imports from England. Is not that sufficient to show discrimination against England and to show that this so-called preferential clause gives no preference to the mother country? But I have a curious testimony on the same subject. I have here the "Iron Age," a journal published in the United States. And what did it say of the tariff as soon as it was passed:

"The new tariff, therefore, cannot 'be properly described as one discriminating against the United States. A 'further examination of it and of the 'attitude of the Government will completely free it from any suspicion of 'being anti-American. It is not too 'much to say, indeed, that it shows 'a strongly pro-American bent. First 'of all, there is the offer of reciprocity. Next, there is the treatment 'of American products in the general 'tariff.'

As to this offer of reciprocity the "Sun," which I have already quoted, says that whatever the Ministers may say, their object is not to have a preference with England, but to have a preference with the United States. And the Toronto "World," which has been referred to here, had articles a short time ago declaring that the Ministers were looking to Washington. And here we have this American paper saying that the tariff has a pro-American bent:

"Of all the changes made in the general tariff, the most sweeping were 'those made in the duties on iron

"and steel and the manufactures 'thereof. Large slices were taken off 'most of the old duties, and some of 'the most important articles, such as 'mining machinery and—next year— 'barbed wire were put on the free list. 'What foreign country will receive 'most, if not all the advantage of 'this? Clearly the United States. It 'is true Britain gets her goods in at 'a rate of duty now 12 1-2 per cent, 'and next year 25 per cent, less than 'the general rate, but nobody supposes, the Government least of all, 'that she can ship iron and steel 'goods into this country against United States competition.

"Looking over the whole list of 'Canadian imports of iron and steel 'goods, we find in nearly every article that the balance is enormously 'in favor of the United States.' Then the "Commercial," a Canadian journal, says:

"Even of bar iron, of which, until 'recently, we imported altogether 'from the United Kingdom to supplement our own output, a larger quantity is now supplied to us from over 'the line than from Great Britain; 'our imports of bar iron in the fiscal 'year ending June 30 last amounting 'to \$52,827 from Britain and \$56,587 'from the United States.'

This is in line with the figures given yesterday by the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster). The whole article goes on strongly to point out that this tariff is more in favor of the United States than of England. So that this so-called discrimination in favor of England is a sham. The Gordian knot is an afterthought on the part of the right hon. Prime Minister. There was no Gordian knot to be cut by Alexander of Macedon, and there was no such difficulty as the Minister of Trade and Commerce tried to make out in getting the denunciation of these treaties for which he claimed so much credit for the Premier.

Now let me say of the right hon. gentleman that so far as representing us personally in the Jubilee was concerned, I think he represented us well. The hon. gentleman who leads the

Opposition has borne testimony more than once to the way in which he represented us. He is a gentleman, he is a man of culture, he is a fine orator, and he represented us well in those respects. I have seen a letter written by a lady high in society in England, commenting on the Premier, and she said that the reason the Canadian Premier was thought so much of was that, compared with the other Premiers, he was a much more refined man. Well, we all know that, and I have always borne testimony to the fact. I was glad to see what Mr. Willison said in his account in the "Globe," although he probably exaggerated a little, for the London papers did not say that our Premier was the most prominent figure. The "Spectator" made out that the six most prominent individuals, after Her Majesty, were all soldiers, mentioning us first amongst them. But I have no doubt whatever that my right hon. friend behaved himself in such a way as to ask for no allowances—to quote my own language of last session—to be made for him. I was glad to see that he attracted so much of Imperial public attention, and if my patriotic pride received a dash at all, it was in this: It pained me for a moment to observe that this Imperial public attention was divided to some extent with my right hon. friend by the South Australian kangaroo. Now, Sir, the kangaroo has to some extent the best of it, for he has remained under the royal roof, and has become a royal institution; and although I am glad to see that the right hon. gentleman has come back with a title, if that was necessary to happiness, honored by Her Majesty, still the Atlantic rolls between him and the eyes of royalty, whereas the eyes of royalty rests on the South Australian interesting importation. But there is one other advantage the kangaroo has. The cries of the kangaroo are the same today as they were then, and they have always been the same, and he jumps in precisely the same way. (Laughter). But I am afraid, Sir, the cries of my right hon. friend will continue to vary, and that he will jump

and box the compass in the same eccentric fashion that he has done in the past. As to these titles, I want to say something more about them. The right hon. gentleman went to Renfrew and there a clergyman addressed him and said: "Sir Wilfrid Laurier." The right hon. gentleman said: "No, not Sir Wilfrid, plain Mr. Laurier." I am a democrat to the hilt." Now, Mr. Speaker, what was the meaning of that? Did the right hon. gentleman mean that he was a social democrat or a political democrat? He cannot have meant exactly that he was a political democrat, because that would mean favoring an undivided government of the people, and would show that he was anti-monarchic, and I believe that he is loyal to our constitution. So he must have meant that he was a social democrat, and did not want those factitious distinctions to separate him from his fellow-men. I am with the right hon. gentleman in that. A man may be loyal to the British Empire, a man may be thoroughly devoted, as I am, to the British Empire and yet may feel that with us here in Canada, where after all we are a great democratic community, titles are a mistake. For instance, there is one title that we cannot wear without being ridiculous. The moment you make a man a lord in Canada he flies from Canada, because in Canada he is a lord without a slave. For instance, Lord Mount-Stephen, when he received that title intended to live in Montreal, but he found that somehow it would not do, there was something ridiculous about it. When he would go into the St. James Club, and they "my-lorded" him, they were ready to laugh in his face. It does not suit. The only thing that seems to go down is just the title of Sir, a knighthood or a baronetcy. So I assume that the hon. gentleman meant that, because here was a pledge to that portion of the people throughout Canada who feel strongly on that question. You will find them amongst the farmers, you will find them in cities, and you will find them in Toronto and elsewhere, men who believe that it

is a mistake to have titles in Canada. That was a pledge to these people that he would not take the title. There was no necessity for it, such as may sometimes lead to a change of political opinion. This was a matter entirely within my right hon. friend's own will; and yet the shoes were not old that carried him to Renfrew when he took a title and became a right hon.; then he goes over to Paris and takes a Grand Cross of the Legion of Honor. Why, Sir, it is one of the most extraordinary things in his extraordinary career. It may be said of him as was once said of a Roman Emperor, that if he had not reigned, everybody would have said he could have reigned magnificently. After my right hon. friend became Prime Minister in twenty short months, say in two years, judging him by his utterances prior to the election of 1896, and his utterances since, he has gone through the whole compass, boxed every point of that compass; so that the quadrature of Laurierian opinion is one of the most difficult things that was ever attempted; you might as well attempt to square a solar parallax. (Cheers.)

I see my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce has come in and I would like to call his attention to some things that I have said; even at the risk of repeating myself. I wish then to say to the Minister of Trade and Commerce that in his absence I have read that fine utterance of his in a speech made in 1878, in which he said, but in more eloquent words than I can use, that nothing was juster than that an engineer should be hoist with his own petard; in which he said that nothing was juster than to gibbet men with their own utterances; to compare their performances with their utterances, and to show them up to the people of Canada. I have also quoted that hon. gentleman's statements in regard to economy, and I have shown that their economy has taken the form of adding \$1,400,000 to our expenses. I have quoted the hon. gentleman's utterance in regard to purity, and although I cannot say that

there is an utter corruption, I may say, to put it in a still more metaphorical way, that the people of Canada are not in a mood to-day to believe that there is very much purity on those benches. I have also called attention to the fact that this great veteran of parliamentary life, this master of parliamentary fence, this master of all the arts of Parliament, of all the weapons in the whole armoury of parliamentary debate, that when he rose to reply to the ex-Finance Minister and to the leader of the Opposition who had made the greatest indictment that had ever been made against a Government, all he could say was that, in metaphorical language, the leader of the Opposition was a liar, that if the hon. gentleman had lived 1900 years ago Sapphira would have preferred him to Ananias. I see that the hon. gentleman is greatly amused at his own joke. Does the hon. gentleman think, however, that with such gingerbread as that the people will be satisfied? Does the hon. gentleman suppose that when the people see this Queen's Speech they will be satisfied with such a meagre bill of fare when they supposed there was going to be a substantial banquet? Does the hon. gentleman suppose that the Liberal party that he educated up to believe in purity, to believe in economy, to believe in crushing corruption in every form, to believe contractors were dangerous persons to entrust with power—does he believe that the people will be satisfied with what we now see taking place? I want to call the hon. gentleman's attention to what is said about contracts in the speech from which I have already quoted. I hinted that this business was—and in designating it I suppose I shall have to refer to someone entirely outside of this House—in its complexion and construction that of an enormous trust. Here is what the Minister of Trade and Commerce said as to the sources of supply for a Government that wants to be corrupt:

"The Red Parlor, alias the protective manufacturers (of which the



"hon. member for Toronto stands a distinguished ornament, and Mr. Gurney is powerful in the stove trust), all of whom were expected to contribute in proportion to the advantages they received.

"Next in order comes the contractors on public works. Here there is every opportunity for a corrupt government, and the evidence given before the committee of the House last session show it was made the most of."

I ask the attention of the House particularly to this statement in view of the Klondyke deal:

"The Minister practically holds almost every contractor at his mercy, and except in the case of a dispute and of some party turning Queen's evidence, detection is a very difficult matter."

Look at the Klondyke matter. I read the contract yesterday. It is within the power of the Government to allow the company to make enormous earnings under any circumstances, but a mere turn of the hand on the part of the Government could put millions in their pocket. What does this mean on the eve of an election, when a party can go to these men and say that the party requires \$200,000 or \$300,000? Of course it will be forthcoming. That is what the Minister of Trade and Commerce meant by this reference. As the hon. gentleman has now come to his seat, I will again revert to the tariff. The hon. gentleman said in that speech:

"This state of things is due to a fiscal system which has turned a considerable percentage of the most active business men into legalized robbers, how much to steady and systematic debauchery of the subsidized press, and how much to the spectacle of direct, continuous and organized corruption with which every politician is only too familiar." "Legalized robbers" is the phrase that the Minister applies to manufacturers, and it must be remembered that those manufacturers are to-day as well protected as when he made that speech. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. Foster. Better.

Mr. Davin. The member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram) says that they are better protected, and that they have confidence. And so what hopes have the farmers of the Northwest Territories of having those promises implemented, when the Minister of Trade and Commerce refuses to answer the appeals of his own party and the appeals of the independent press? The hon. gentleman must have read what the "Star" said of him—that he is the last plank to which the pure Liberals of this country were clinging. That journal declared that he is the last hope of the pure Liberals to save them from the boodling element. How is the hon. gentleman doing it? In a weak and ineffective way he defends the Klondyke deal, and hon. gentlemen opposite, knowing well that he is a powerful man and a man of experience and knowledge, awaited his statement in response to the cheers that greeted him the other night. They were cheers from the Liberal ranks that the hon. gentleman did not receive in other days. They marked the lingering hope that there was still one sound plank in the Government, which would stand fast in putting down boodlers in contracts entered upon by the Government; and the "Star" appealed to him, and the best element of the Liberal party appealed to him, but I am sorry to say there is no sign that the hon. gentleman is going to rise to the opportunity afforded him.

I have here a paragraph written by Mr. Willison, from London, and which appeared in the "Globe" on October 23rd, 1897. Mr. Willison wrote, praising the right hon. the Prime Minister:

"But while ornate and eloquent, it was soon found that his head was in thorough command of his tongue, and that he could not be stampeded by any organized demonstration of cheering or led into by-paths by the seductive luring of even the Duke of Devonshire or Mr. Chamberlain. What was the seductive luring of the Duke of Devonshire and Mr. Chamberlain but the candid and broad offer



of preferential trade? So we have it stamped and driven home that as regards Canada obtaining preferential trade, although the Prime Minister found on visiting England that not merely the statesmen, but the farmers were prepared to accord it, he cast it aside and came back and declared it was all a piece of flippery, a piece of diplomacy. (Cheers.) Of course we cannot take stock in it, none whatever. In regard to this matter I do not think it is necessary to say anything further, for if ever there was a nail driven home, that nail has been driven home.

I spoke about promises not being kept. One of the promises is a very interesting one at the present moment, for it seems to be that one of our institutions in the future is to be the hon. member for North, Wellington (Mr. McMullen). One of the promises made was this, that the Government would not spend money on expensive buildings in small places. But what did we see last session? We saw—and probably this is the explanation why the hon. gentleman is coming up to reign at the palace at Regina—the hon. member voting with twenty Tories against the present Government. On concurrence he moved a resolution in regard to public buildings and was supported by nineteen members, including the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Bain), and some other good Liberals. Thus we had the hon. gentleman voting against his party, and I rather think he planned to make things unpleasant for the Government just as Mr. Langeller had

done; and as Mr. Langeller was hoisted on the bench, so the hon. member for Wellington is going to be a figure-head for the Northwest vessel, now breasting its future, for it has just been launched into practically responsible government, and I suppose this appointment will be made partially because the hon. gentleman planned to make it unpleasant for his friends. There was another promise that has not been kept. It was a promise in regard to votes for railways. That promise has not been kept, but there is not a promise made by the party now in power that has been kept. We are entering on a new era. Although we are entering on a new era, who are the real leaders of the country? The Conservatives. One epoch is, ever the child of another. The epoch that has gone before this epoch of thirty years, the epoch of national expansion, was the natural father of this epoch of Colonial equality and Imperial Union, and yet we hear from the Government nothing but a faltering cry. But throughout the Dominion of Canada that note is strong, and that note will receive expression, and when the first opportunity occurs the people of the country will overthrow this Government, which stands with its pledges violated, its honor stained, its record lowered in the dust by its own conduct for these twenty months. That Government, Sir will at the first opportunity, melt away like in the rays of the sun in early spring a mockery King of Snow. (Loud and prolonged Opposition cheers.)